

Residents' Perceptions of the 2010 FIFA World Cup: A Case Study of a Suburb in Cape Town, South Africa

**Dion Chain
Kamilla Swart**

Abstract

Sport tourism events have grown in prominence globally. Governments increasingly include these activities into their development strategies. Notably, there are benefits and costs to host destinations. The 2010 Federation Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup presents South Africa with tangible and intangible impacts. Residents' perception studies on sport event impacts are limited and it is further recognised that those living closest to the stadium are most impacted by the development. This study investigated Green Point residents' perceptions of the 2010 FIFA World Cup and the impacts of the Green Point Stadium (now named Cape Town Stadium), especially given the contentious nature of the selection of the competition venue for the City of Cape Town. A spatially based stratified random sampling method was used to interview 344 residents living within one kilometre of the Stadium. The findings reveal that while the location of the stadium remains a contentious issue with some of the respondents, a large majority of residents are in favour of the chosen stadium site in Green Point. Residents also expressed their support for the event but indicated various levels of participation. They also generally have positive perceptions and attitudes toward the 2010 FIFA World Cup but highlighted concerns in relation the negative environmental impacts of the event, social concerns with respect to inconveniences related to traffic congestion and crime and social inequities. It is concluded that the purported macro-

economic and social costs and benefits seem to override concerns expressed at a local level. It is therefore recommended that these concerns be addressed through more democratic planning processes to reduce the negative impacts and enhance the potential benefits.

Keywords: 2010 FIFA World Cup, sport tourism, mega-events, impacts

Introduction

Sport tourism events are globally significant in terms of their ability to generate popular appeal and this strategy is used by communities to attract investment (Turco *et al.* 2002:73). Hiller (1998:47) notes that bidding and hosting sport mega-events is linked to the economic benefits from these events. Jones (2001:241) and Turco *et al.* (2003:223) confirm that mega-events contribute significantly to economic development but also emphasises its increasing importance in the development of tourism. On the other hand, Andranovich *et al.* (2001:114) emphasise the importance of national and international media attention for the host city derived from hosting these sport events.

South Africa in comparison with other African countries has aggressively promoted itself as a host destination for major international sport events (Cornelissen 2005:138). Cornelissen adds that this emphasises the country's ambitions around sport mega-events and sporting events in the context of its wider internationally focussed tourism and other urban development programmes. According to Kotze (2006:291) and Pillay *et al.* (2008:1), South Africa successfully hosted the 1995 Rugby World Cup, the 1996 African Cup of Nations and the 2003 Cricket World Cup which helped create a new image and identity for the country, reflecting a new post-apartheid society further amplifying its reputation as a 'rainbow nation'. The successful hosting of these events helped leverage the country's position in bidding and hosting of other major sport events.

Pillay and Bass (2009:77) note that a very comprehensive and well grounded plan emerged in the bid phase for the 2010 FIFA World Cup, laying the foundation for a truly meaningful development agenda. Furthermore, the mega-event presented the nation with the ideal opportunity

to give the country's urban development agenda increased momentum (Pillay & Bass 2009:79). Cornelissen (2005:144) confirms that the bid was underpinned by economic and developmental objectives in conjunction with goals of reconciliation and nation building. As a result of its robust attempt to position itself in the international mega-events arena (Cornelissen, 2005:138), South Africa won the right to host the first FIFA World Cup which was held on the African continent from 11 June to 11 July 2010 utilising ten stadiums in nine cities around the country.

Several authors (Turco *et al.* 2002:158; Kim & Petrick 2005:27; Kim *et al.* 2006:89; Fredline 2008:393) confirm that although there are number of studies that have been conducted on residents' perceptions of tourism developments, there is a lack of research investigating the responses of residents in perceiving the impacts of mega-events. Moreover, Turco *et al.* (2002:158) indicate that few impact studies have specifically investigated residents' attitudes towards sport tourism events in their community. Pillay and Bass (2009:81) suggest that public perceptions with regard to a range of issues need to be constantly measured and analysed to directly inform the part of the development agenda that speak about the benefits that could potentially accrue.

The aim of this article is to provide an understanding of Green Point residents' perceptions of and attitudes towards the 2010 FIFA World Cup, especially given the contentious nature of the selection of the competition venue in Cape Town. The objectives were firstly, to assess residents' perceptions about the location of the Green Point Stadium. It must be noted that the Green Point Stadium was subsequently renamed to Cape Town Stadium by the City of Cape Town (CoCT) after the study was conducted (CoCT 2009a). Therefore, reference will be made to Green Point Stadium throughout the article. The second objective is to explore the level of support of residents for the 2010 FIFA World Cup; and finally, to evaluate the residents' perceptions of and attitudes toward the mega-event.

The Impacts of Sport Tourism Events

Kurtzman (2005:49) notes that sport tourism includes six supply-side tourism categories: events, resorts, cruises, attractions, adventures, and tours. Mega-events are located within the events category and are defined 'in terms of the

number of visitors, length of the event and/or the degree of presence or absence of touristic developments' (Kim *et al.* 2006:86). Fredline (2004:156) indicates that understanding the potential impacts of events and how these may affect the quality of life of residents is a fundamental part of sport event planning and management processes. However, they often tend to be overlooked in the bidding and hosting phases of a mega-event. The next section will briefly highlight the benefits and costs associated with hosting sport tourism events.

The Benefits of Hosting Sport Mega-events

The touted benefits of major sport events for a host destination are wide ranging (Black 2007:261). Andranovich *et al.* (2001:114) indicate that mega-events allow cities to focus on economic development and attention for gain. Tassiopoulos and Haydam (2008:870) add that sport tourism events are recognised as powerful forces for development, stimulating investment in infrastructure projects which can be enjoyed by both the local population and tourists alike. According to Feng (2008:125), city officials generally use similar motivations for investing in sport facilities. Feng adds that these claims usually revolve around substantial economic impacts such as income increases, job creation, and tax-revenue increases. Rosentraub (2008:66) confirms that the potential exists for new sport facilities to be developed which in turn generate important benefits for governments and residents in the long-term. Both Black (2007:261) and Tomlinson (2009:100) add that the anticipated benefits of mega-events for host cities also include unrivalled 'place promotion' opportunities, re-imaging of the city, creating awareness and branding of the city, aimed at expanding investments, tourism, and not least the ability to attract future events.

Swart and Bob (2007:37) note that the FIFA World Cup has numerous benefits. They state that in addition to leaving a lasting legacy for the hosts through the development of international standard sporting facilities and related infrastructure upgrades, the hosting of this event provides a country and city high profile promotion of their products and services which is given global exposure. Lee *et al.* (2005:840) confirm that the FIFA World Cup not only increases tourism receipts, income and

employment; it also raises awareness and knowledge of the country or region involved.

Chalip (2006:112) argues that events offer more than just economic value, the energy, excitement and togetherness of community increases its appeal, making it attractive to host and to attend. Haferburg *et al.* (2009:195) note that public viewing areas (PVAs) contribute to social interaction and cohesion, enhancing the social experience by hosts and guests. In addition, PVAs create a myriad of business opportunities for the local residents (Haferburg *et al.* 2009:195; Saayman and Rossouw 2008:4).

Pillay and Bass (2009:79) noted that that the South African government recognised urban development and renewal as a key national imperative, stating that this has gained momentum and has become critical as a result of hosting the World Cup in 2010. In addition, it will improve intangible benefits like national pride and more than likely nurture a true South African identity. The event in essence gives the country a unique opportunity to fast-track urban development, while also providing the prospect of reconstructing underdeveloped and peripheral areas around South Africa (Pillay & Bass 2009:80). However, Collins *et al.* (2007:459) indicate that any benefits of hosting sports events are likely to be a series of ‘costs’ that are rarely considered in ex-ante or ex-post economic assessments. The negative costs of mega-events will be examined next.

The Costs of Hosting Sport Mega-events

Gursoy and Kendall (2006:608) and Kim *et al.* (2006:88) indicate that host communities, political leaders and organisers frequently ignore the negative impacts and glorify the expected benefits. Cornelissen (2005:149) suggests that mega-events produce varied, often negative economic outcomes and that they are costly affairs, the opportunity costs related to them need to be queried when they are too high, especially for developing countries. This assessment becomes more pertinent in the context of Africa. Kim and Petrick (2005:25) add that economic cost impacts of sport tourism events include price inflation for tourism goods and services, opportunity and substitution costs. In addition, increases in crime, environmental degradation, and disruption of resident’s lifestyles and patterns may also yield economic costs. Turco *et al.* (2002:56) state that quantifying some of these impacts into

economic terms is difficult and that difficulty may be one reason why they are typically ignored.

Haruo and Toshio (2002:183) indicate that residents often raise concerns about the negative aspects of sport mega-events such as the absence of a long-term operational plan for the new sport facilities; the burden of a long and heavy financial debt on local taxpayers. Pillay and Bass (2009:87) argue that infrastructure provision does not benefit the local residents because it is often not extensively used after the event. In addition, improvements in transport, infrastructure, service provision and the quality of urban fabric, will be highly centralised and benefits for marginal urban, rural areas and non-host cities will be limited.

Horne (2007:89) indicates that the impact of mega-events on employment should be treated with caution. Pillay and Bass (2009:76) add that while there may be low and intermediate-skilled job creation opportunities in the construction and built environment sectors ahead of the 2010 World Cup, these are likely to be mostly short-term and/or temporary employment opportunities involving a limited number of people.

Sporting events potentially attract criminals who engage in criminal activities as a result of the temporal and spatial opportunities for tourism-related crime which is enhanced during the hosting of the event (Barker 2004:175-179). In addition, other common nuisances that have a widespread impact on the local community by event visitors may be related to public drunkenness, disorderly conduct, vandalism and hooliganism (Barker 2004:175-179).

Residents' Reactions to Sport Tourism Events

Kim *et al.* (2006:87) state that several factors affect the way residents evaluate the rewards of hosting a mega-event in relation to the costs before hosting the event. They further note that social exchange theory suggests that local residents are likely to form perceptions which are likely to differ based on the expected value of the exchange before the actual exchange occurs. The social representation theory asserts that local residents are likely to form their own preconceptions and images that based on each individual's value system and experiences. Consequently several authors (Kim & Petrick 2005:28; Kim *et al.* 2006:89 and Ohmann *et al.* 2006:130) state that

measuring perceptions of mega-events often lack credibility and objectivity due to varying residents' views, nevertheless it is critical to assess their attitudes towards the potential impacts.

A longitudinal study by Kim *et al.* (2006:93) concerning the impact of the 2002 FIFA World Cup revealed that residents' perceptions changed over time. While residents had high expectations of economic and cultural benefits, these were lower than anticipated; and the economic benefits in particular were a disappointment. In addition, concerns regarding vandalism, prostitution and crime and increases in property prices as well as goods and services were much less than residents expected. Traffic congestion appeared to be the largest problem during the event however it was managed better than residents expected.

A study by Ohmann *et al.* (2006:129) on the perceived social impacts of the 2006 FIFA World Cup on residents of Munich revealed that the impacts were mainly perceived to be positive in terms urban regeneration, increased sense of security, positive fan behaviour and the general atmosphere surrounding the event. They also note that fewer residents perceived negative impacts related to increased crime, prostitution and displacement of local residents.

It is further stressed that while there are a range of factors that contribute to residents reactions to sport events, it is important to understand what influences these responses (Fredline 2004:155). Fredline (2004:166) adds that people living closer to the event may have different reactions to those living away further away. Fredline notes that residents living close to these events are subject to localised impacts such as noise, traffic and parking and access restrictions to a larger extent than those residents that reside further away from the event location. Swart and Bob (2009:123) confirm and agree that residents of host localities, more especially those that reside close to the event are stakeholders that are directly impacted by these events.

Pillay *et al.* (2008:1) indicate in their findings of a longitudinal survey on South Africans attitudes towards the 2010 World Cup that people consistently perceive there to be benefits from hosting this mega-event. These benefits include economic growth, job creation, profiling South Africa and increased tourism.

Turco *et al.* (2002:1) indicate that hosting sport mega-events come with a huge degree of importance and prestige and this often leads to fast tracking the planning and development often ignoring community resistance to hosting the event or the construction of associated infrastructure. Fredline (2004:155) cautions that residents' may engage stakeholders in several ways in order to stop or delay the event by taking legal action, form protest groups or even vote against public officials who support the event if they are not consulted or included in the process. The newly built Green Point Stadium is a case in point and is further elaborated upon in the next section.

Hosting the FIFA World Cup – Cape Town, Western Cape

Green Point Stadium was the designated competition venue in the CoCT (CoCT 2008a). The CoCT indicated that hosting the 2010 FIFA World Cup gives the city a unique opportunity to improve its infrastructure by taking advantage of funds made available nationally for these 2010 related projects which include new stadiums, transport and other upgrades. In addition, the event presents a platform to market Cape Town and the Western Cape to the world thereby creating a more desirable destination for leisure, business and its residents. The City further indicated that hosting this mega-event will leave the country and the region with a lasting legacy through tangible and intangible benefits (CoCT 2008a). However, the stadium location was highly contested in the initial stages of development as outlined next (CoCT 2008b).

Choosing a Location: The Green Point Stadium Debate

Cape Town's initial competition venue was changed from Newlands Stadium to Athlone Stadium in 2004 by the City Council and the Western Cape provincial government (Alegi 2004:318). Several authors (Alegi 2004:318; Cornelissen 2007:251; Western Cape Government & CoCT 2007:7) note that the change from Newlands Stadium to Athlone Stadium would bring much needed social development opportunities to the area from the 2010 World Cup.

FIFA was approached to consider the change from Newlands Stadium to Athlone Stadium, which was agreed to in principle but was

subject to a site inspection (Western Cape Government & CoCT 2007:7-8). Green Point Stadium was initially proposed to be a training venue. However, FIFA was not willing to consider Athlone as an option after its inspection, moreover the organisation was surprised that Green Point was not put forward as the competition venue. FIFA noted that it was a prime location to showcase the city, South Africa and the continent through the event (Western Cape Government & CoCT 2007:7).

It must be mentioned that after lengthy venue selection disagreements in Cape Town, FIFA expressed preference for the Green Point Stadium even though the site was not initially identified by bid promoters (Cornelissen 2007:250). Green Point was eventually chosen as the official competition venue for the 2010 FIFA World Cup in Cape Town while Athlone Stadium was chosen as a training venue, leaving the city with a long-term benefit in the form of a key legacy that emerged from the event (Bob & Swart 2009:50).

Adding to the venue selection delay, Detlinger (2007:1) reported that the CoCT received notification of objection to building the stadium in Green Point from residents living in Green Point, Sea Point and Mouille Point during the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process undertaken by Provincial Government. Notably, the strongest opposition came from Cape Town Environmental Protection Association (CEPA) which staged protests and initiated court actions to prevent the CoCT from building the stadium in Green Point (CoCT 2008b). According to the City's 2010 World Cup spokesperson, Pieter Cronje (as cited in Detlinger 2007:1), the objections centred around the stadium being built in the area, while other concerns raised were noted as traffic congestion and disruption, noise, the attraction of anti-social elements, the impact on property values and increasing rates bills, cost overruns and escalations. Further concerns highlighted by residents which were noted by the city included questions surrounding the sustainability of the stadium and the stadium not being completed on time for the event, hence becoming a 'coliseum' (CoCT 2008b).

The Western Cape government (Cape Gateway 2008) argued that this was the best location for the stadium and a prolonged delay meant that the Western Cape would lose out on the benefits of hosting some World Cup matches in the city. However, after a number of legal confrontations with the City, the group finally agreed and reached a so called 'compromise scenario'

to the building of the stadium at this site and the Green Point Common Association was given a say in the management of the urban park planned around the stadium precinct (CoCT 2008b; Detlinger, 2007).

Methodology

The suburb of Green Point is located at the foot of Signal Hill, a geographically significant landmark in Cape Town. It is situated approximately two to three kilometres northwest from the city centre. Green Point together with Three Anchor Bay and Sea Point form part of Ward 54 (City of Cape Town 2009b:3).

The questionnaire used to assess residents' perceptions was based on the survey instrument that was developed by Fredline and Faulkner (2002) and Fredline (2004) and was modified and adapted to suit the South African context. Questions focused on the location of the stadium, event support in terms of participation and perceptions and attitudes toward the event.

The target population of the study was Green Point residents that resided within one kilometre of the Green Point Stadium. Interviewer completed surveys were conducted between June and July 2009 using a spatially based stratified random sampling method. The targeted sample size of respondents was 346 and the actual response rate was 344 respondents. Residents were interviewed in homes and flats situated on both sides of the street. The Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to analyse the data.

Findings, Data Analysis and Discussion

This section sets out the findings, analysis and discussion of the responses of residents from the primary data collected. Tables are used to present the findings.

Demographic Profile of Respondents

A demographic profile of respondents reveals that 54.7% were male while 45.3% were female (Table 1). Historically, Green Point was a White

residential suburb (Bob & Swart 2009:50), which is clearly reflected in the historical racial classification. The results indicate that more than half of the respondents were White (53%) and the rest were African (26.7%), Coloured (17.7%) and Indian (2.6%) (Table 1).

The age of respondents interviewed ranged from 19 years to 85 years. The average age of the respondents was 40.7 years. More than 67.1% of the respondents had post-school qualifications, with the majority possessing certificates/diplomas (31.7%). In terms of the respondents employment status, 15.4% of the respondents indicated that they were self employed, 13.1% were retired, 12.8% were employed as administrators/managers while 10.8% indicated sales/marketing. The average income of respondents was R10 092.

Table 1: Gender and historical racial classification

Gender	Percent (n=344)
Male	54.7
Female	45.3
Historical racial classification	
White	53.0
African	26.7
Coloured	17.7
Indian	2.6

Location of Stadium

Despite the objections to the stadium by CEPA, it is important to note that the majority of the respondents (75%) were in favour of the stadium being located in Green Point (Table 2). This represents strong support for the competition venue by residents living in close proximity to the stadium, and who are likely to be most impacted by the stadium (Fredline 2004:166).

Table 2: Level of agreement with the Green Point Stadium location

	Percent (n=344)
Yes	75
No	25

On the other hand, 25% of the respondents objected to the stadium being located in their area. Respondents cited the following reasons for their objection:

- The area is small and does not have adequate infrastructure to handle high volumes of people and traffic (9.6%);
- the stadium should not be built in a residential area (6.7%);
- the stadium should have been built in an area that could have benefited from the resulting infrastructure upgrade and sporting facilities (4.1%);
- soccer fans live away from the area, the stadium would have been better suited and more accessible if it was constructed closer to where the soccer fans live (2.6%);
- there was no consultative process in deciding where the stadium should be located (1.2%); and
- less than one percent (0.9%) of the respondents indicated that building the stadium changes the landscape of the area and interrupts views from residents' homes.

These concerns were similar to those raised by CEPA in their objection the stadium, and reference is also made to the lack of public consultation that may have contributed to raising these concerns about the stadium location. This disagreement with the stadium location, albeit by a minority of residents, supports Fredline's (2004:155) contestation that residents may engage stakeholders in several ways in order to stop or delay the event by taking legal action, form protest groups or even vote against public officials who support the event if they are not consulted or included in the process as mentioned previously.

Despite some of the residents not being in favour of the stadium location, the results illustrate positive attitudes and strong support among residents to 2010 stadium development and the World Cup in general. Notably, these high levels of support by residents for the stadium being located in the area where they reside are consistent with findings from a previous study conducted by Swart and Bob (2009:125) that indicated a high rate of support for the Green Point Stadium. It could be argued that since

community comments and concerns were required for the EIA and the fact that and the Green Point Common Association was given a say in the management of the urban park planned around the stadium precinct as part of the compromise reached, this engagement could have contributed to a large proportion of residents supporting the stadium location.

Event Support

Slightly more than half of the respondents (50.9%) indicated that they would be attending the 2010 FIFA World Cup matches while 49.1% indicated the opposite (Table 3).

Table 3: Respondents' attendance of 2010 FIFA World Cup matches

	Percent (n=344)
Yes	50.9
No	49.1

Of the 50.9% who indicated that they would attend 2010 World Cup matches, 93.1% indicated that they intended to attend matches in Cape Town while 3.4% indicated that they would attend matches in Johannesburg. Less than two percent each indicated that they would attend matches in Durban (1.7%), Pretoria (1.1%) and Port Elizabeth (0.6%). No respondents indicated that they would attend matches in Rustenburg, Nelspruit, Polokwane and Bloemfontein.

In addition, respondents (49.1%) were requested to provide reasons for not attending any of the 2010 FIFA World Cup matches. Some of the respondents (34.9%) indicated that they were not interested in soccer, 27.8% prefer to watch the matches on television, 20.1% indicated that they would not be able to afford the tickets and 17.2% specified other reasons. Respondents cited the following reasons:

- Unable to access tickets (5.8%). Respondents indicated that they were unable to access tickets due to the lengthy and cumbersome ticket purchase process;
- Travelling abroad for the duration of the event (4.6%);

- Work commitments during the event (4.2%);
- Don't like large crowds (1.2%);
- Too much noise at the stadium (0.6%); and
- Do not agree with the location choice (0.6%).

However, when respondents were asked whether they would consider watching the 2010 FIFA World Cup matches on television, an overwhelming majority (87.2%) indicated that they would consider it while 12.8% indicated that they would not watch any matches on television.

Table 4: Respondents use of the dedicated spectator locations

	Percent (n=344)
Yes	60.8
No	39.2

In addition, 60.8% indicated that they would consider watching the matches at the dedicated PVAs, while 39.2% were not interested in watching the matches at these sites (Table 4). Moreover, 54.1% felt that access to PVAs should be free while 45.9% of the respondents indicated that they would pay for access. More than ten percent (10.5%) of the respondents indicated that they were willing to pay R100.00, 9% were willing to pay R50.00 and 4.7% were willing to pay R150.00. The average price that respondents were willing to pay for entry into the PVAs was R67.00. Haferburg *et al.* (2009:175) note that there are no access restrictions to the public and no registration is required to use these facilities, although in some cases a fee may be charged. However, the PVAs for the 2010 FIFA World Cup were 'free' events. Notably, the respondents' willingness to pay to use these dedicated facilities highlights the residents' level of support for the event. In addition, it indicates that residents are willing to take part in the associated festivities of the event thereby contributing to the success of the World Cup.

The CoCT used PVAs and the official fan park as interventions to strengthen and create cohesion within the country's and cities' urban fabric thereby providing long term social and spatial benefits (Haferburg *et al.* 2009:195). Bob and Swart (2009:53) confirm that PVAs create opportunities for access to the matches thereby facilitating participation and social interaction by providing dedicated viewing areas.

Notably, the results in this section reveal a moderate to high response of respondents' interest in participating in the event in some way; public viewing was rated the highest, followed by watching on television and watching live matches respectively. These results point to support for the concept of PVAs to increase access to the event and can be considered an indicator of resident support for the event, however cognisance should be taken of issues concerning the accessibility and affordability of tickets for local residents.

Perceptions and Attitudes of Respondents

In order to determine the perceptions and attitudes of residents, respondents were asked to rate the level of agreement with a range of relevant statements pertaining to the 2010 FIFA World Cup. The Lickert scale was used with the following options available as responses: SD = Strongly disagree, D = Disagree, N = Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly agree.

Table 5 presents a summary of resident's perceptions, attitudes and reactions to the impacts of the 2010 FIFA World Cup. As there is a close relationship between the strongly disagreed and disagreed and strongly agreed and agreed responses, it was necessary to group these responses for a greater understanding of the results.

Table 5: Respondents' level of agreement with impacts of the 2010 FIFA World Cup (in %) (n=344)

	SD	D	N	A	SA
Environmental impacts					
Pollution will occur close to the stadium	1.5	14.2	7.0	51.2	26.2
Excessive degradation of land as a result of the tarred areas (such as parking lots) and infrastructural development	2.6	27.3	15.1	35.8	19.2
Economic benefits					
All residents will reap the rewards of the 2010 World Cup	9.6	28.5	17.2	32.6	12.2
Jobs will increase	2.3	7.0	8.4	60.5	21.8
Small business will benefit	0.9	7.3	5.8	62.2	23.8

Residents' Perceptions of the 2010 FIFA World Cup ...

Social impacts					
There will be many inconveniences such as traffic congestion and parking difficulties	2.9	4.9	3.2	41.0	48.0
There will be a higher incidence of criminal activities	4.9	11.6	9.9	39.8	33.7
Locals will benefit from entertainment opportunities created by the 2010 World Cup	3.5	15.1	8.7	50.0	22.7
Community benefits					
Only some members of the community will benefit from the 2010 World Cup event/ the 2010 World Cup event will increase social inequity	6.7	17.7	20.1	43.3	12.2
The event will stimulate training and skills development for members of the community where events are held	2.6	10.8	19.2	54.4	13.1
Ordinary residents will get a say in the planning and management of the 2010 World Cup event	18.9	27.9	16.6	29.1	7.6
Infrastructure development impacts					
Roads, parking facilities and amenities will be refurbished	1.2	1.5	7.0	60.8	29.7
Legacy impact of the 2010 FIFA World Cup					
South Africa will attain a legendary sports event and achieve a legacy	1.7	5.2	15.7	53.2	24.1

Environmental Impacts

Results indicate that 77.4% of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed that pollution will occur close to the stadium while 15.7% strongly disagreed and disagreed with this statement. Respondents' strong agreement and agreement with the above statements support assertions made by Kim *et al.* (2006:89) and Collins *et al.* (2007:473) that highlight residents concerns around the destruction of the physical and natural environment as well as the

perceived negative physical and environmental impacts as a result of the influx of visitors to a host city.

In addition, the above response by respondents mirrors concerns echoed by the CoCT (2009c) that the event will generate large amounts of waste. However, the CoCT plans to introduce waste management plans to minimise pollution. In addition, the CoCT (2009d) in conjunction with the Western Cape government has committed to the 'Green Goal 2010' programme in an effort to raise awareness, minimise waste, diversify and use energy efficiently, compensate for the event's carbon footprint, practise responsible tourism, and construct infrastructure with future generations in mind beyond the duration of the event. Notably, the strong agreement with the above statements by respondents seemingly reflects the CoCT's failure to communicate these environmental management plans to residents leading to lack of awareness of these programmes.

More than half of the respondents (55%) strongly agreed and agreed that there would be excessive degradation of land as a result of the tarred areas (such as parking lots) and infrastructural development while 29.9% strongly disagreed and disagreed with this statement. A further 15.1% of the respondents chose to remain neutral. Respondents' concern associated with the above statement support claims made by Haruo and Toshio (2002:183) and Kim and Petrick (2005:25) that the potential for the destruction of the natural environment exists and is associated with the negative aspect of sport mega-events that may also lead to economic costs.

Economic Benefits

In terms of economic benefits, almost 45% (44.8%) strongly agreed and agreed that all residents will reap the rewards of the 2010 World Cup and 38.1% indicated the opposite. Furthermore, 17.2% of the respondents indicated that they were neutral with regards to this statement.

The majority of respondents (82.3%) strongly agreed and agreed that jobs will increase as a result of the 2010 FIFA World Cup while 9.3% strongly disagreed and disagreed with this statement. There were consistently high levels of agreement in terms of benefits to businesses, with 86% strongly agreeing and agreeing that small businesses will benefit from the

event while 8.2% strongly disagreed and disagreed that any benefits will accrue to small businesses. While residents' expectations pertaining to businesses are high, Smith and Fox (2007:1129) indicate that often events assist local businesses; however there is a likelihood that events can sometimes have the opposite effect. Therefore, support and assistance may be needed to ensure local businesses benefit from the event. Furthermore, they assert that it is important to ensure that local business and disadvantaged individuals are able to benefit from lucrative contracts usually associated with large events.

While there seemed to be strong support for the positive impact of the event on job creation and small business, it is also evident that residents did not believe that the economic benefits would be spread uniformly. These results therefore contradict the more generalised claims made regarding the substantial macro-economic benefits of hosting sport mega-events as mentioned previously.

Social Impacts

In terms of social impacts of the 2010 FIFA World Cup, the overwhelming majority of respondents (89%) strongly agreed and agreed that there will be many inconveniences such as traffic congestion and parking difficulties while 7.8% strongly disagreed and disagreed with this statement. The high percentage of agreement with the above statements support the assertion by Fredline (2004:166) that residents living close to the event sites are subjected to localised event impacts such as noise, traffic and parking, and access restrictions to a greater extent than those living further away.

The majority of the respondents (73.5%) also strongly agreed and agreed that there will be a higher incidence of criminal activities while 16.5% strongly disagreed and disagreed that criminal activities will increase as a result of the 2010 FIFA World Cup. The survey findings reveal strongly that residents have a negative perception about crime, safety and security related to the event as stated earlier in this section. However, Donaldson and Ferreira (2007:369) assert that the South African government supported by all law enforcement agencies, have an ideal opportunity to improve their performance with regard to crime prevention. Notably, this would be a long lasting beneficial consequence for the tourism industry and the local citizens.

The majority of respondents (72.7%) indicated that locals will benefit from entertainment opportunities created by the 2010 World Cup while 18.6% strongly disagreed and disagreed with this statement. These responses indicate that the event has an entertainment value as supported by previous studies conducted by Fredline and Faulkner (2002). Residents' perceptions of the social impacts of the event seem to be mixed with traffic congestion and increases in crime being raised as major concerns, however the entertainment value of the event was also recognised.

Community Benefits

More than half of the respondents (55.5%) strongly agreed and agreed that the event will increase social inequity, indicating that only some members of the community will benefit from the event while 24.4% indicated the opposite. This result is consistent with residents' mixed perceptions of the economic benefits for all residents as highlighted previously. These responses by residents support Pillay and Bass' (2009:92) assertion that more widespread development benefits is not a direct consequence on spending associated with mega-events therefore increases the likelihood of inequality.

In terms of the event stimulating training and skills development for members of the community where events are held, 67.5% strongly agreed and agreed while 13.4% strongly disagreed and disagreed with this statement. The strong agreement and agreement with the above statement support assertions made by Smith and Fox (2007:1128) that some events encourage economic and social regeneration by providing new skills and support for the local people. Furthermore, this is often achieved through volunteer programmes to help stage the event, while offering employment as well as training and skills development (Smith & Fox 2007:1128).

With regard to ordinary residents getting a say in the planning and management of the event, 46.8% strongly disagreed and disagreed with this statement, while 36.7% strongly agreed and agreed indicating that ordinary residents will get a say in this process. The strong agreement and agreement with this statement raise concerns that there is a perception that ordinary residents have no say in the planning and management of the event. This perception was in all likelihood fuelled by a perceived lack of public

consultation by the CoCT, since objections raised are considered merely as part of the EIA and perhaps broader consultation with residents is suggested.

The above reaction by respondents support assertions made by Ntloko and Swart (2008:90) that for community benefits to be addressed there needs to be community involvement in the planning and organising of the event. In addition, community involvement will ensure there is a common understanding of the costs and benefits associated with the event and minimise the potential conflicts between the organisers and the community (Ntloko & Swart 2008:90). This type of engagement goes beyond the input required by residents as part of the EIA process. It may therefore be worthwhile to heed Gursoy and Kendall's (2006:605) advice for future mega-events to adopt a more democratic planning model which can be achieved through a collaborative approach by stakeholders, encouraging engagement, joint decision-making and collective responsibility to resolve conflicts or to advance vision. They further contend that public discussions on the anticipated impacts and widespread community involvement will in all likelihood result in broad agreement on how to reduce the negative impacts and enhance the benefits.

Infrastructure Development Impacts

The results reveal high levels of agreement with infrastructure development impacts, the overwhelming majority (90.5%) strongly agreed and agreed that roads, parking facilities and amenities will be refurbished. These findings supports assertions made by Hall (1997:77) that the hosting of major sporting events is often used to rejuvenate or redevelop urban areas that require renewal through the construction and development of new infrastructure, including roads and rail networks, airports, sewage and housing. In addition, Tassiopoulos and Haydam (2008:870) note that tourism and sport stimulates investment in infrastructure projects which can be enjoyed by both the local population and tourists alike. The results indicate that residents have very high expectations regarding improvement of their general quality of life in the form of infrastructure development as a result of the mega-event.

Legacy Impact of the 2010 FIFA World Cup

The majority of the respondents (79.4%) strongly agreed and agreed that the country will attain a legendary sport event and achieve a legacy. The above findings support assertions by Hall (1997:75) and Standeven and De Knop (1999:204) that mega-events are extremely significant as they leave behind legacies which will have an impact on the host community far greater than the period in which the event took place. Residents therefore acknowledged the long-term impacts of the 2010 event.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Understanding the potential impacts of events and how these may impact on residents is a critical aspect of sport tourism event management and planning. The research aimed at investigating Green Point residents' perceptions, attitudes and views of the 2010 FIFA World Cup, specifically in relation to the Green Point Stadium, the competition venue for the City of Cape Town. This study was undertaken due to the highly contentious nature of the selection of the stadium location in Cape Town, and given that studies of local residents' perceptions of mega-events are limited and tend to be overlooked in the bidding and hosting phases of a mega-event.

While the location of the stadium remains a contentious issue with some of the respondents, a large majority of residents are in favour of the chosen stadium site in Green Point. For the large majority, perhaps the fact that community comments and concerns were taken into consideration in the EIA and the involvement of the Green Point Common Association in the management of the urban park around the stadium precinct as part of the compromise position achieved, could have contributed to the positive support for the stadium location. What is less clear and needs to be investigated in future studies is whether the purpose of community participation is to improve plans and mitigate negative externalities or simply to alleviate concerns.

Residents' participation in the event is an indicator of event support; however this support was varied. Participation via public viewing was rated the highest, followed by watching on television and the lowest form of participation was as a spectator at live matches. The concept of PVAs was

therefore supported while concerns regarding direct participation as a result of accessibility and affordability of tickets are further noted.

While residents generally have positive perceptions and attitudes toward the 2010 FIFA World Cup, it is important to highlight the concerns forwarded. Residents raised concerns about the negative environmental impacts of the event, despite the City's proposed plan to 'green' the event. These concerns seemingly reflect the CoCT's failure to communicate these plans to residents resulting in a lack of awareness of these programmes. The results further contradict the widely held notion of the positive macro-economic benefits of a mega-event in that residents did not perceive the economic benefits to be spread uniformly and the event will increase social inequity. Residents also expressed social concerns with respect to inconveniences related to traffic congestion and crime. Seemingly, the purported macro-economic and social costs and benefits seem to override concerns expressed at a local level. It is therefore recommended that these concerns be addressed through more democratic planning processes to reduce the negative impacts and enhance the potential benefits.

Although nearly half of the residents indicated that they do not get a say in the planning and management of the event, this perspective is counterbalanced by some residents expressing that they indeed have a say in the planning and management of the event, possibly due to their comments being considered as part of the EIA process and as a result of the Green Point Common Association getting a say in the management of the urban park planned around the stadium precinct. However, it is recommended that residents are continuously engaged beyond the EIA requirements in order to improve the plans especially for the residents in closest proximity to the stadium and who are impacted the most. Finally, longitudinal research is recommended to evaluate changes in residents' attitudes and the potential impacts of the 2010 FIFA World Cup over a period of time.

References

- Andranovich, G, Burbank, MJ & Heying, CH 2001. Olympic Cities: Lessons Learned from Mega-event Politics. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 23,2: 113-131.

- Alegi, P 2004. *Laduma! Soccer, Politics and Society in South Africa*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- Barker, M 2004. Crime and Sport Tourism Events: The 1999-2000 America's Cup. In Ritchie, BW & D Adair (eds): *Sport Tourism: Interrelationships, Impacts and Issues*. Clevedon: Channelview Publishing.
- Black, D 2007. The Symbolic Politics of Sport Mega-events: 2010 in Comparative Perspective. *Politikon* 34,3: 261-276.
- Bob, U & Swart, K 2009. Residents' Perceptions of the FIFA 2010 FIFA Soccer World Cup Stadia Development in Cape Town. *Urban Forum* 20: 47-59.
- Cape Gateway 2008. 2010 Football World Cup Strategic Plan. http://www.capegateway.gov.za/Text/2007/1/2010_strat_plan_27_jan_06_2.pdf Accessed on: 09 September 2008.
- Chalip, L 2006. Towards Social Leverage of Sport Events. *Journal of Sport and Tourism* 11,2: 109-127.
- City of Cape Town 2008a. 2010 FIFA World Cup. <http://www.capetown.gov.za/en/2010/Pages/default.aspx> Accessed on: 04 September 2008.
- City of Cape Town 2008b. 2010 Fifa World Cup News: 2010 Stadium. http://www.capetown.gov.za/en/2010/news/Documents/Archives/2010_stadium.htm Accessed on: 09 September 2008.
- City of Cape Town 2009a. The City's 2010 FIFA World Cup Stadium has a New Name: Cape Town Stadium. <http://www.capetown.gov.za/en/FIFA2010/Pages/default.aspx> Accessed on: 03 December 2009.
- City of Cape Town 2009b. About the New Mayco Members. *Contact*, 35: 1-24, April/May.
- City of Cape Town 2009c. 2010 to Generate a Whole Lot of Waste. <http://www.capetown.gov.za/en/Pages/2010togenerateawholelotofwaste.aspx> Accessed on: 12 November 2009.
- City of Cape Town 2009d. Green Goal: Background to Hosting a Responsible 2010 FIFA World Cup event. <http://www.capetown.gov.za/en/GreenGoal/Pages/default.aspx> Accessed on: 12 November 2009.
- Collins, A, A Flynn, M Munday & A Roberts 2007. Assessing the Environmental Consequences of Major Sporting Events: The 2003/04 FA Cup final. *Urban Studies* 44,3: 457-476.

- Cornelissen, S 2005. *The Global Tourism System – Governance, Development and Lessons from South Africa*. Hants: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Cornelissen, S 2007. Crafting Legacies: The Changing Political Economy of Global Sport and the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *Politikon*, 34,3: 241-259.
- Davies, LE 2005. Not in my Back Yard! Sports Stadia Location and the Property Market. *Area* 37,3: 268-276.
- Detlinger, L 2007. New Snag Hits 2010 Stadium Progress. *Cape Argus* http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?set_id=1&click_id=124&art_id=vn20070220112234247C913983 Accessed on: 26 January 2009.
- Donaldson, R & S Ferreira 2007. Crime, Perceptions and Touristic Decision-making: Some Empirical Evidence and Prospects for the 2010 World Cup. *Politikon* 34,3: 353-371.
- Feng, X 2008. Professional Sports Facilities, Teams, Government Subsidies, and Economic Impact. In Humphreys, BR & DR Howard (eds): *The Business of Sports – Economic Perspectives on Sport: Vol. 2*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Fredline, L 2004. Host Community Reactions to Motorsport Events: The Perception of Impact on Quality of Life. In Ritchie, BW & D Adair (eds): *Sport Tourism: Interrelationships, Impacts and Issues*. Clevedon: Channelview Publishing.
- Fredline, E 2008. Host and Guest Relations and Sport Tourism. In Weed, M (ed): *Sport and Tourism: A Reader*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Fredline, E & B Faulkner 2002. Variations in Residents' Reactions to Motorsport Events – Why Residents Perceive the Impacts of Events Differently. *Event Management* 7,2: 115-126.
- Gursoy, D & KW Kendall 2006. Hosting Mega-events - Modelling Local's Support. *Annals of Tourism Research* 33,3: 603-623.
- Hall, CM 1997. Mega-events and their Legacies. In Murphy, PE (ed): *Quality Management in Urban Tourism*. West Sussex: Wiley.
- Haferburg, C, T Golka & M Selter 2009. Public Viewing Areas: Urban Intervention in the Context of Mega-events. In Pillay, B, R Tomlinson & O Bass (eds): *Development and Dreams: The Urban Legacy of the 2010 Football World Cup*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

- Haruo, N & M Toshio 2002. Building mega-events. In Horne, J & W Manzenreiter (eds): *Japan, Korea and the 2002 World Cup*. London: Routledge.
- Hiller, HH 1998. Assessing the Impact of Mega-events: A Linkage Model. *Current Issues in Tourism* 1,1: 47-57.
- Hinch, T & J Higham 2004. *Sport Tourism Development*. Clevedon: Cromwell Press.
- Horne, J 2007. The Four 'knowns' of Sport Tourism Mega-events. *Leisure Studies* 26,1: 81-96.
- Jones, C 2001. Mega-events and Host Region Impacts: Determining the True Worth of the 1999 Rugby World Cup. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 3:241-251.
- Kim, HJ, D Gursoy & S Lee 2006. The Impact of the 2002 World Cup on South Korea: Comparisons of Pre- and Post-games. *Tourism Management* 27: 86-96.
- Kim, SS & JF Petrick 2005. Residents' Perceptions on Impacts of the FIFA 2002 World Cup: The Case of Seoul as Host City. *Tourism Management* 26: 25-38.
- Kotze, N 2006. Cape Town and the Two Oceans Marathon: The Impact of Sport Tourism. *Urban Forum* 17,3: 282-293.
- Kurtzman, J 2005. Economic Impacts: Sport Tourism and the City. *Journal of Sport Tourism* 10,1: 47-71.
- Kurtzman, J 2005. Economic Impacts: Sport Tourism and the City. *Journal of Sport Tourism* 10,1: 47-71.
- Ntloko, NJ & K Swart 2008. Sport Tourism Event Impacts on the Host Community: A Case Study of Red Bull Big Wave Africa. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation* 30,2: 79-93.
- Pillay, U & O Bass 2009. Mega-events as a Response to Poverty Reduction: The 2010 FIFA World Cup and Urban Development Implications. In Pillay, B, R Tomlinson & O Bass (eds): *Development and Dreams: The Urban Legacy of the 2010 Football World Cup*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Pillay, U, O Bass & B Roberts 2008. Field of Dreams or Despair? *HSRC Review* 6,3:1-3.

- Rogerson, CM & G Visser (eds) 2007. *Urban Tourism in the Developing World: The South African Experience*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Rosentraub, MS 2008. Sports Facilities and Urban Redevelopment: Private and Public Benefits and a Prescription for a Healthier Future. In Humphreys, BR & DR Howard (eds): *The Business of Sports - Bridging Research and Practice: Vol. 3*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Saayman, M & R Rossouw 2008. The Economic Value of the 2010 Soccer World Cup. *Acta Commercii* 8: 1-14.
- Smith, A & T Fox 2007. From 'event-led' to 'event-themed' Regeneration: The 2002 Commonwealth Games Legacy Programme. *Urban Studies* 44,5/6: 1125-1143.
- Standeven, J & P de Knop 1999. *Sport Tourism*. Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- Swart, K & U Bob 2007. The Eluding Link: Toward Developing a National Sport Tourism Strategy in South Africa beyond 2010. *Politikon* 34,3: 373-391.
- Swart, K & U Bob 2009. Venue Selection and the 2010 World Cup: A Case Study of Cape Town. In Pillay, B, R Tomlinson & O Bass (eds): *Development and Dreams: The Urban Legacy of the 2010 Football World Cup*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Tassiopoulos, D & N Haydam 2008. Golf Tourists in South Africa: A Demand-side Study of a Niche Market in Sports Tourism. *Tourism Management* 29: 870-882.
- Tomlinson, R 2009. Anticipating 2011. In Pillay, B, R Tomlinson & O Bass (eds): *Development and Dreams: The Urban Legacy of the 2010 Football World Cup*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Turco, DM, R Riley & K Swart 2002. *Sport Tourism*. Morgantown: Fitness Information Technology, Inc.
- Turco, DM, K Swart, U Bob & V Moodley 2003. Socio-economic Impacts of Sport Tourism in the Durban Unicity, South Africa. *Journal of Sport Tourism* 8,4: 223-239.
- Western Cape Government and City of Cape Town 2007. *2010 Football World Cup Strategic Plan for the Provincial Government of the Western Cape and the City of Cape Town*.

Dion Chain and Kamilla Swart

Zauhar, J 2003. Historical Perspectives of Sport Tourism. In Hudson, S (ed):
Sport and Adventure Tourism. Binghamton: The Haworth Press.

Dion Chain
Cape Peninsula University of Technology
dionchain@gmail.com

Kamilla Swart
Cape Peninsula University of Technology
swartk@cput.ac.za